

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

STEVEN WAYNE FELDMANN,

Case No. 20-CV-588 (NEB/BRT)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER ON REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

THE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
OF ALBERT ARMENDARIZ SR.;
DR. DANIELS, Chief of Psychiatry, and
DR. WAKEMAN,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Steven Wayne Feldmann filed a complaint against the defendants, an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a motion to change venue on February 24, 2020. (ECF Nos. 1–3.) In a Report and Recommendation dated March 26, 2020, United States Magistrate Judge Becky R. Thorson recommended that (1) this matter be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), (2) Feldmann’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied, and (3) Feldmann’s motion to change venue be denied as moot. (ECF No. 7 (“R&R”).) On April 13, 2020, Feldmann filed a letter stating that it is “Re: Filing an objection in accordance to Local Rule 72.2(b)(1).” (ECF No. 10 at 1.) Feldmann’s letter neither mentions the R&R, nor raises any objection to it. (*Id.*) Rather, Feldmann requests a subpoena of medical records,

financial restitution, to be summoned to the court, and immunity, among other things.
(*Id.* at 1–2.)

A district court “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). “Without objections, a district court is under no obligation to review the factual or legal conclusions of such a report, absent requirements from the Circuit in which it sits.” *Reed v. Curry Concrete Constr., Inc.*, No. 10-CV-4329 (JRT/LIB), 2011 WL 2015217, at *2 (D. Minn. May 23, 2011) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)). After carefully reviewing Feldmann’s filing, the Court concludes that he does not raise any objection to the R&R. Because Feldmann raises no objections, the Court reviews the R&R for clear error. *Id.* (collecting cases); *see also Grinder v. Gammon*, 73 F.3d 793, 795 (8th Cir. 1996) (per curiam) (acknowledging that district courts review R&Rs for clear error absent an objection). The Court finds Judge Thorson’s reasoning sound and finds no legal basis to depart from her recommendations.

Finding no clear error, and based on the foregoing, and on all the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 7) is ACCEPTED;
2. This matter is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B);

3. Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is DENIED;
and
4. Plaintiff's motion to change venue (ECF No. 3) is DENIED AS MOOT.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: April 29, 2020

BY THE COURT:

s/Nancy E. Brasel
Nancy E. Brasel
United States District Judge